

## **Breakout session**

Group 1, Friday, September 26, 2008

Rapporteur: Karen Hibbard-Rode

Our discussion was restricted to only 35 minutes, and focused largely on maritime boundaries and trade, and human rights issues. Below is a summary of the discussion.

Natural resources drive the development of the Arctic Ocean, now and into the future. The IMO (a UN organization) is the 1<sup>st</sup> step in international regulation, with holistic laws. There are opportunities for the Arctic States to take actions, but there are challenges. There is no infrastructure in the open ocean and financing is a challenge. The Arctic Ocean also needs to be charted for international standards for navigation. Maybe the Arctic Council's role is to give visibility to those issues and drive research.

The path of least resistance drives commerce; ice is resistance. This will happen sooner than later. Consumers ask for the carbon emissions of products—this could drive suppliers to shorter (Arctic) routes. But, if there is a shift to reliance on local producers, we should reduce intercontinental transport. Alaska has the world's largest sustainable fishery, but cannot bring fish to market. If we can go from Dutch Harbor to Europe, that will change. It's difficult to imagine decreased trade; the cost of shipping is minimal compared to the cost of production. Local is not always sustainable. Most CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted in trucking cherries from eastern to western Washington than in shipping them from Chile. Economies of scale (e.g. China) drive international trade.

We need to remember the people of the Arctic. We need mechanisms to get to “yes” on developments that benefit Arctic people. Inuit communities agree that *everyone* is against offshore drilling, because of the impact to whales. Indigenous people are not just stakeholders; they are *rights* holders. But, indigenous communities get left out. We need to internalize the external costs of economic activities. Oil spills are problems not matter what; we need institutions that accompany changing economic activities.

A looming legal issue is property rights vs. freedom of passage. We can't restrict free passage on the high seas. There's a need to talk; the Bering Strait makes the coast guard lose sleep. How are human rights within multi-lateral governments incorporated into the conversation? Human rights are very relative. The climate change resolution on human rights will help people talk more. Nunavut favors mining, which requires shipping. There's a

tendency to romanticize indigenous people are environmentalists. Looking at route possibilities, we have to ask about the net benefit to indigenous people.

There are environmental impacts of shipping. It's not just shipping, there are ports, which will drive more extractions. Debated this: it really matters where emissions are—they absorb faster over ocean and not at all over ice, vs. CO<sub>2</sub> takes a long time to absorb anywhere, so it is not a local issue.

Is ice water or something else? Should there be a law of Sea Ice? Debated this: Ice is water, it's frozen but mobile vs. ice has different uses, and the USSR and U.S. occupied sea ice.

Finally, it was noted in this discussion and others throughout the NRF that men were speaking more than women, and senior scientists more than young researchers. President Grimsson called the NRF a “village square where everyone's voice can be heard”. We need to make more effort to allow space for women and young researchers to contribute. (After suggesting this to the large group, the discussions on the final day of NRF seemed considerably more balanced).